

MEETING SUMMARY

Fuel Cycle Oversight Program Revisions Public Stakeholder Meeting

February 8, 2001, 10 am to 1:25 pm

Location: OWFN 16B4

Discussion: The purpose of this stakeholder meeting was to discuss the work plan and communications plan for the oversight revision project. There were over 30 attendees, including representatives of licensees, NEI, DOE, the State of Illinois (IDNS), and UCS. Highlights from the meeting included:

Consensus was reached on the types of changes to be made to the Licensee Performance Review (LPR) process, i.e., the LPR will be made more risk-informed and timely. There seemed to be a general understanding that the LPR will remain the heart of NRC assessment of licensee performance, thus addressing NEI's concern that the revised oversight framework would replace the LPR.

Some changes to the communication plan need to be made to comport with current work plan (e.g., we are no longer planning to conduct a pilot of the oversight revisions). Further changes may be necessary as a result of the efforts being made in response to the SRM (issued on 1/17/01) from the 12/20/00 Commission briefing on this project. Also, in response to NEI objections about the extent of public outreach proposed in the communication plan, UCS recommended that we do the public outreach in conjunction with already planned LPR public meetings for each facility (this recommendation was adopted and will be reflected in the communication plan and implementation plan).

Adjustments need to be made to the work plan for several items. Adjustments include more clearly defining the scopes, objectives, and target dates of several tasks. Scope changes are outlined in the following paragraphs.

Licensee Problem Identification, Resolution, and Corrective Action Programs:

The purpose of this task is to develop the process and procedures for NRC oversight and crediting of licensee problem identification, resolution, and correction in a timely manner commensurate with risk and regulatory requirements. NEI has the lead for this activity. At the 2/8/01 meeting, NEI committed to caucus with licensees to develop a proposal for how to proceed. NEI and licensees indicated during the meeting that this activity will depend on the outcome of the ongoing work on the Part 70 SRP.

Additionally, a need was identified to develop NRC program guidance on how the effectiveness of licensee corrective actions will be factored into performance assessment and NRC response to performance.

Inspection Program changes: Consensus was reached on the scope of inspection program changes associated with this revision project. A two step

process is envisioned; the first step will be to revise IMC 2600 to comport with the framework that has been developed. The second step will begin in FY 2002, after program structural changes being developed have been implemented, and will consist of doing detailed revisions to the inspection procedures in parallel with the maturation of the Part 70 revisions.

Performance Indicators: Part 70 licensees remain hesitant on the use of PI's. However, USEC volunteered to pilot the use of PI's at the GDP's, provided that there is a reduction in the inspection effort (the USEC representative at the meeting said that they would be interested in a quid pro quo). This is one piece of the work plan that may be amenable to piloting. HQ and R III staffs need to develop a plan to do this. Industry-wide adoption of PI's appears to be unfeasible in the near term.

Program Implementation: We are still shooting to implement the program on 10/1/01. However, there was broad understanding that this would be a first step, and that all facets of the NRC's oversight of fuel cycle facilities will continue to evolve along with the changes that will accompany licensees' implementation of the revised Part 70.

UCS recommended that NRC incorporate guidance on how we will assess the effectiveness of the oversight program into the implementation plan; we intend to do this.

Summary of Public Meeting Feedback Forms

Fuel Cycle Oversight Program

February 8, 2001

There were over 30 attendees at this meeting, 27 of whom put their names on the sign-in sheet. A total of nine feedback forms (NRC Form 659) were received from meeting attendees. The information on these sheets is summarized below.

1. Why did you attend this meeting?

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| b. I work for an interested organization | 8 |
| c. Other | 1 (NRC employee) |

2. Were you familiar with the meeting topic prior to coming today?

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| a. Very | 5 |
| b. Somewhat | 4 |

3. How did you find out about this meeting?

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| a. NRC mailing list | 2 (one of these respondents also cited the internet, so is double counted) |
| d. Internet | 4 (one specified NRC website) |
| e. Other | 4 (one specified NRC e-mail and another listed NEI as the information source) |

4. Have you attended an NRC meeting before?

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| b. 1 or 2 times | 1 |
| c. 3 to 5 times | 2 |
| d. More than 5 times | 6 |

5. Was sufficient notice given in advance of the meeting?

- | | |
|--------|---|
| a. Yes | 8 |
| b. No | 1 |

6. How well do you feel you understand the NRC's role with regard to the issues discussed today?

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| a. Very well | 6 |
| b. Somewhat | 3 |

7. Were you able to find all of the supporting information you wanted prior to the

meeting?

- | | |
|--|---|
| a. Yes | 5 |
| b. I did not try to find any information | 2 |
| c. No | 1 |

One respondent did not answer.

8. Was the purpose of the meeting made clear in the preliminary information you received?

- | | |
|--------|---|
| a. Yes | 8 |
| b. No | 1 |

9. In your opinion, were people's questions answered clearly, completely and candidly?

- | | |
|--------|---|
| a. Yes | 8 |
| b. No | 1 |

10. Was the written material useful in understanding the topic?

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| a. Very | 6 |
| b. Somewhat | 3 |

11. Were NRC's presentations and material presented in clear, understandable language?

- | | |
|--------|---|
| a. Yes | 8 |
| b. No | 1 |

12. In your opinion, did the meeting achieve its stated purpose?

- | | |
|--------|---|
| a. Yes | 7 |
| b. No | 1 |

One respondent did not answer.

13. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic?

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| a. Greatly | 5 |
| b. Somewhat | 3 |
| c. Not at all | 1 |

14. How well did NRC staff respond to your concerns at the meeting?

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. My concerns were directly addressed | 3 |
| b. I was provided an alternate source of information to address my concerns | 1 |
| c. I did not raise my concerns at this meeting | 4 |

One respondent did not answer.

15. Was adequate time allotted for discussion with NRC staff on the topic of today's meeting?

- | | |
|--------|---|
| a. Yes | 8 |
| b. No | 1 |

16. How satisfied are you overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting?

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| a. Very | 6 |
| b. Somewhat | 3 |

17. Were the next steps in this process clearly explained, including how you can continue to be involved?

- | | |
|--------|---|
| a. Yes | 7 |
| b. No | 1 |

One respondent did not answer.

Contact: One respondent (Steve Singal of DOE) requested that he be contacted following the meeting. During followup contact by P. Castleman, Mr. Singal asked to be placed on our distribution lists (which was done). He had no further concerns.

Comments

Two of the nine respondents provided written comments. The respondents did not identify themselves; hence the NRC staff response to the comments are provided below.

Respondent A:

1. Comment: At beginning of meeting, all attendees were introduced. Many people came into the meeting after the introduction without being introduced.

NRC Staff Response: NRC staff agrees that it is important to have meeting attendees identify themselves. Normally, this is done at the start of the meeting and again when an attendee makes his or her first contribution to the discussion. To the extent practicable, at future meetings we will ask late arrivals to introduce themselves during breaks in the discussion.

2. Comment: There were several long side conversations among NRC staff members during the meeting that were distracting and discourteous.

NRC Staff Response: NRC staff agrees with this comment. Staff will take two actions at future meetings to address this issue. First, at the opening of the

meeting, and as needed thereafter, we will ask attendees to limit side conversations. Second, we will make a stronger effort to keep the meeting discussions focused on the agenda and moving crisply.

Respondent B:

1. Comment: Not a very productive meeting. Greater efforts should be made to state meeting objectives -- especially for those of us who traveled some distance to attend.

NRC Staff Response: NRC staff will continue to make efforts to clearly state the purposes of Fuel Cycle Oversight revision meetings. In response to this specific comment, without further background information, staff cannot commit to specific corrective actions. We would also note that eight of the nine attendees who submitted public meeting feedback forms felt that the purpose of the meeting had been made clear in the preliminary information they had received.

2. Comment: The transition from Walt Schwink to Mr. Castleman clearly needs more work.

NRC Staff Response: NRC staff agrees with this comment. "Passing the torch" on a project of this scope requires time, effort, and attention to detail. Mr. Schwink is Mr. Castleman's immediate supervisor, and the two of them will continue to interact on a routine basis.